

## ATTACHMENT 8 – SUMMARY OF REVIEW PANEL RESPONSES TO LEAD ENTITY COMMENTS

Summary of Review Panel Responses to Key Lead Entity Comments				
Lead Entity	POC removal		Increase rating	
	Comment	Response	Comment	Response
<i>Grays Harbor</i>	NA		<p>Certainty - modeling as mentioned in the narrative is not supposed to be a rating criterion.</p> <p>Fit (actions/areas) - it was recently learned that project #7 addresses depressed stock.</p>	<p>Certainty - modeling was not a specific criterion or requirement used in making the rating determination. Changes were made to the panel's narrative for clarification.</p> <p>Fit - new information does not warrant a change in rating.</p>
<i>Hood Canal</i>	NA		Fit-to-strategy rank order rating of Excellent/Good should be increased.	The list fits well with the level of specificity in the strategy. The panel feels that in this case, in view of all lead entity strategies and project lists statewide, the small reduction from 'Excellent' is associated with the acknowledged need for further emphasis on prioritization.

## Summary of Review Panel Responses to Key Lead Entity Comments

Lead Entity	POC removal		Increase rating	
	Comment	Response	Comment	Response
<i>King 9</i>	NA		<p>Increase ratings from 'Good.'</p> <p>New information provided to clarify tools and approach to prioritization for ratings of 'fit.'</p> <p>A supportive quote from Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team was provided to the panel.</p>	<p>The panel acknowledges the substantial efforts and work by the lead entity leading to a chapter of the Puget Sound recovery plan.</p> <p>The summary matrix provided at the meeting between the lead entity and panel was helpful, but didn't contribute toward a change in fit ratings, as the underlying information was in the strategy materials.</p> <p>Specific comments from the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team were unavailable to the panel; thus the panel had no context within which to consider how the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team may have viewed this strategy in contrast to those of other lead entities contributing to the recovery plan. Similarly, the panel had no context with respect to the extent to which the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team quote aligns with SRFB criteria for an 'Excellent' rating, or to a lesser rating.</p> <p>The panel revisited its consistency for the fit-to-strategy rating for actions and areas and raised the rating from 'Good' to 'Excellent/Good.'</p>
<i>Kitsap (East)</i>	NA		<p>The panel's apparent orientation to listed Chinook is overly simplistic and does not adequately accommodate the multi-species (listed and non-listed species) approach. It is unclear which of the two Chico Creek projects the panel refers to in their narrative.</p>	<p>The strategy indicates that Chinook are the highest priority, and that the strategy takes a multi-species approach. SRFB rating criteria clearly asks whether projects are in <u>highest</u> priority areas. The rating reflects actions and areas and how well focused those are. A clarification of the Chico projects is included in the final report.</p>
<i>Klickitat</i>	NA		<p>The community issues rating should be raised from 'Excellent/Good' to 'Excellent.'</p> <p>The certainty rating should be raised from 'Fair.' A critique of Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment modeling is provided.</p>	<p>Information provided did not lead to elevating the ratings.</p> <p>Certainty - modeling was not the specific criteria used in the rating determination. A clarification of the certainty rating is included in the final report.</p>

## Summary of Review Panel Responses to Key Lead Entity Comments

Lead Entity	POC removal		Increase rating	
	Comment	Response	Comment	Response
Lower Columbia	#3, 7, 8, 9, 19	#3 POC removed	<p>Increase rating of 'Fair' fit-of-list to highest priority actions and areas, because it does not account for multi-layered approach to the lead entity prioritization scheme involving multiple listed species.</p> <p>Comments regarding ongoing work related to fit of project ranking narratives are noted.</p>	<p>The SRFB rating criteria clearly ask whether projects are in highest priority areas. The information provided confirmed the panel's draft rating that is based on the fact that a large proportion of the projects are not in the highest priority areas.</p> <p>The complexity of the other aspects associated with planning and developing a list at the regional scale are not now featured in SRFB rating criteria.</p>
Mason	NA		Clarifying comments were provided regarding the 'Good/Fair' certainty rating.	NA
Nisqually	NA		NA	
North Olympic	NA		Specificity and focus for actions and areas was lower this year than last. Why? The 'Fair' fit-of-the-list to strategy rating is too low and is not clearly explained. The 'Good/Fair' fit-of-project ranking rating is too low and the rationale for it is unclear.	Watershed pages are new elements of strategy materials submitted, and are a good addition. However, some variability exists in the level of specificity in them. In light of progress made in this rating category by other lead entities across the state, the strategy (although similar to last year's strategy) received a lower rating. As acknowledged, <u>all</u> projects are not in tier 1 areas but are concentrated in one part of the lead entity strategy area. The SRFB rating criteria for 'Excellent' is unambiguous regarding <u>highest</u> priority areas and actions. Ranking criteria are not in question, but the role of the strategy and linkages between it and the ranking criteria do not appear to be well aligned.
Okanogan	#1,2,9	POC #1 & 2 removed	NA	
Pacific	#6	POC removed	NA	
Quinault	NA		Certainty - modeling is mentioned in the narrative and should not have been a rating criteria or requirement.	<p>Certainty - modeling was not a specific criterion or requirement used by the panel in making the rating determination.</p> <p>Changes were made to the panel's narrative for clarification.</p>
San Juan	#1, 2	POC #1 removed	NA	
Snake	#7	POC removed	NA	
Snohomish	NA		NA	

## Summary of Review Panel Responses to Key Lead Entity Comments

Lead Entity	POC removal		Increase rating	
	Comment	Response	Comment	Response
<i>Stillaguamish</i>	NA		NA	
<i>Thurston</i>	NA		Clarifying comments were provided regarding ratings of 'Good/Fair' for certainty and for 'Fair' for fit of the list to actions and areas.	The panel considered the information provided but did not change the rating.
<i>WRIA 1 - Nooksack</i>	#3	POC remains	All projects are in high priority areas, even if one is not in a 'highest' priority area.	The value of high priorities is not in question. However, SRFB rating criteria for excellent are unambiguous. That criteria addresses how well a portfolio contains projects in 'highest' priority areas, thus no change in rating is warranted.